1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332) United States Attorney BRIAN STRETCH (CSBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7359 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 denise.barton@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff
9	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13 14 15 16 17 18	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. REMSEN BENEDICT, Defendant. PCR No. 08-0025 WHA STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3161
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	On February 5, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from February 5, 2008 through March 18, 2008. The parties represented that granting the continuance was necessary for effective preparation and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, //

to afford defense counsel time to review discovery and in light of upcoming knee surgery and a 1 2 medical leave of counsel for the government. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 3 4 SO STIPULATED: 5 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO 6 United States Attorney 7 8 **DATED:** March 18, 2008 /s/ Denise Barton **DENISE MARIE BARTON** 9 Assistant United States Attorney 10 11 **DATED:** March 18, 2008 12 **GEOFFREY DUNHAM** Attorney for REMSEN BENEDICT 13 14 As the Court found on February 5, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds 15 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and 16 17 the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act 18 calculations from February 5, 2008 through March 18, 2008 for effective preparation and continuity of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested 19 continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into 20 21 account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. 22 §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 23 SO ORDERED. 24 25 March 25, 2008. DATED: 26 27 United States District Court Judge 28